## Link

Expunging criminal records prevents the nuclear power industry from confirming that their employees are actually trustworthy. **Adams 12**[[1]](#footnote-1)

Please, Fairfield County council and sheriff, whatever you do, **do not** even **think about expunging criminal records. The nuclear industry values honesty and dependability more than** almost **any other characteristics** in its work force for very good reasons. We do not just worry about “violent” crimes, but about records that indicate a lack of fundamental integrity. **It would be** far **better for someone to provide accurate details about their youthful indiscretions and what actions they have taken to ensure that they never happen again than to fail to accurately report them.**

If there is a pattern of misbehaving, there is a good reason why that person is not a good fit for the nuclear industry.

It would be beneficial for the people of your county if nuclear industry employers could count on your records being accurate. It would be terribly detrimental if there is even a hint that the records might have been purged to make local people look better. Just think how that knowledge would affect those people in your county who did not run into any scrapes with the law. Do you think it is possible that employers would start looking elsewhere in order to lower the possibility of hiring someone whose skeletons might be found out later?

In small towns, people have long memories. It seems likely to me that there will always be people who remember youthful indiscretions. If I was an employer, I would be worried about the risk of having **someone with an expunged record on** my **payroll** – they **might live in fear that someone will tattle at any time.** It’s even possible that the **knowledge of what used to be in the record could be used as** a **blackmail** tool.

## Accidents Impact

Employee background checks are key to preventing accidents. **Resner 12**[[2]](#footnote-2)

As part of the program, all employees are required to report to their supervisors any suspicious behavior they see among their coworkers. **Suspicious behavior could be a worker** observed **in an area of the plant where they don’t have authorization to be, or if a worker made threatening statements about harming people or plant equipment.**

The NRC regulations even require workers to report on themselves or “self-disclose” if they, for whatever reason, believe they are no longer mentally and physically fit to safely perform their duties. An example of this is an employee undergoing marital problems that are causing them stress that interferes with their duties. Such an employee may be referred to an Employee Assistance Program or their assigned duties may be changed until the person is deemed fit for duty.

If a determination is made to deny the person unescorted access for any reason, their name and that fact is entered into an information sharing database that NRC requires all U.S. nuclear power plants to use. Should that person attempt to enter (or get a job at) another nuclear plant, the information about their access status would be available for review by the plant they were attempting to access. Ultimately, a **determination that an employee is not trustworthy** or reliable – based on behavior observation or self reporting — has serious implications for that person maintaining their access authorization but such determinations are **[is] necessary to keep nuclear power plants operating safely** in their communities.

Nuclear accidents risk extinction. **Lendman 11**[[3]](#footnote-3)

For years, Helen Caldicott warned it's coming. In her 1978 book, "Nuclear Madness," she said: "As a physician, I contend that **nuclear tech**nology **threatens** life on our planet with **extinction.** If present trends continue, **the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink will soon be contaminated** with enough radioactive pollutants to pose a potential health hazard **far greater than any plague humanity has ever experienced.**" More below on the inevitable dangers from commercial nuclear power proliferation, besides added military ones. On March 11, New York Times writer Martin Fackler headlined, "Powerful Quake and Tsunami Devastate Northern Japan," saying: "The 8.9-magnitude earthquake (Japan's strongest ever) set off a devastating tsunami that sent walls of water (six meters high) washing over coastal cities in the north." According to Japan's Meteorological Survey, it was 9.0. The Sendai port city and other areas experienced heavy damage. "Thousands of homes were destroyed, many roads were impassable, trains and buses (stopped) running, and power and cellphones remained down. On Saturday morning, the JR rail company" reported three trains missing. Many passengers are unaccounted for. Striking at 2:46PM Tokyo time, it caused vast destruction, shook city skyscrapers, buckled highways, ignited fires, terrified millions, annihilated areas near Sendai, possibly killed thousands, and caused a nuclear meltdown, its potential catastrophic effects far exceeding quake and tsunami devastation, almost minor by comparison under a worst case scenario. On March 12, Times writer Matthew Wald headlined, "Explosion Seen at Damaged Japan Nuclear Plant," saying: "Japanese officials (ordered evacuations) for people living near two nuclear power plants whose cooling systems broke down," releasing radioactive material, perhaps in far greater amounts than reported. NHK television and Jiji said the 40-year old Fukushima plant's outer structure housing the reactor "appeared to have blown off, which could suggest the containment building had already been breached." Japan's nuclear regulating agency said radioactive levels inside were 1,000 times above normal. Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under a worst case core meltdown, all bets are off as the entire region and beyond will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the most affected areas unsafe to live in. On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying: Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a **reactor meltdown**." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened – **[is] the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter.** According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at **Chernobyl** in 1986. In fact, that disaster **killed nearly one million** people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. **One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe. Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere."** Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, **millions of lives will be jeopardized.** Japanese officials said Fukushima's reactor container wasn't breached. Stratfor and others said it was, making the potential calamity far worse than reported. Japan's Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency (NISA) said the explosion at Fukushima's Saiichi No. 1 facility could only have been caused by a core meltdown. In fact, 3 or more reactors are affected or at risk. Events are fluid and developing, but remain very serious. **The possibility of an extreme catastrophe can't be discounted.** Moreover, independent nuclear safety analyst John Large told Al Jazeera that by venting radioactive steam from the inner reactor to the outer dome, a reaction may have occurred, causing the explosion. "When I look at the size of the explosion," he said, "it is my opinion that there could be a very large leak (because) fuel continues to generate heat." Already, Fukushima way exceeds Three Mile Island that experienced a partial core meltdown in Unit 2. Finally it was brought under control, but coverup and denial concealed full details until much later.

## Prolif Impact

High security standards for nuclear power are key to solve global prolif.

**Cunningham 12** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

Second, **the U.S. has played a fundamental role in** building the nuclear **non-prolif**eration regime. Beginning with President Eisenhower and the “Atoms for Peace” plan, the U.S. has supported the peaceful use of nuclear power while preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is the leading licensing and regulatory body for nuclear industry worldwide, and it sets the standard for safety that other countries follow.. Not only does **the U.S. “export”** high **safety standards** in its reactor designs, but through 123 Agreements it **[and] requires rigorous non-prolif**eration **measures** as a requirement of doing business with American nuclear companies. **With China expected to** more than **triple the number of** installed nuclear **reactors** between 2011and 2015, **the U.S. may become less relevant** in ensuring adequate safeguards against weapons proliferation. 6 **A strong domestic nuclear industry will** better **position the U.S. to lead** on this issue.

Prolif is the largest existential threat. **Miller 02** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

The U.S. should use whatever means necessary to stop our enemies from gaining the ability to kill millions of us. We should demand that countries like Iraq, Iran, Libya, and North Korea make no attempt to acquire weapons of mass destruction. We should further insist on the right to make surprise inspections of these countries to insure that they are complying with our proliferation policy. What if these nations refuse our demands? If they refuse we should destroy their industrial capacity and capture their leaders. True, the world's cultural elites would be shocked and appalled if we took preventive military action against countries that are currently doing us no harm. What is truly shocking, however, is that America is doing almost nothing while countries that have expressed hatred for us are building weapons of mass destruction. France and Britain allowed Nazi Germany's military power to grow until Hitler was strong enough to take Paris. America seems to be doing little while many of our foes acquire the strength to destroy U.S. cities. **We can't rely upon deterrence** to prevent an atomic powered dictator from striking at us. Remember, the Nazi's killed millions of Jews even though the Holocaust took resources away from their war effort. As September 11th also shows, **there exist evil men** in the world **who would gladly sacrifice all other goals** for the opportunity **to commit mass murder.** The U.S. should take not even the slightest unnecessary chance that some dictator, perhaps a dying Saddam Hussein, would be willing to give up his life for the opportunity to hit America with nuclear missiles. **Once a dictator has** the ability to hit a U.S., or perhaps even a European city, with **atomic weapons it will be too late** for America **to pressure him** to give up his weapons. **His ability to hurt us will** effectively **put him beyond** our **military reach.** Our conventional forces might even be made impotent by a nuclear-armed foe. Had Iraq possessed atomic weapons, for example, we would probably have been unwilling to expel them from Kuwait. What about the rights of those countries I have proposed threatening? America should not even pretend to care about the rights of dictators. In the 21st century the only leaders whom we should recognize as legitimate are those who were democratically elected. The U.S. should reinterpret international law to give no rights to tyrants, not even the right to exist. We should have an ethically based foreign policy towards democratic countries. With dictatorships, however, we should be entirely Machiavellian; we should deal with them based upon what is in our own best interests. It's obviously in our self-interest to prevent as many dictators as possible from acquiring the means to destroy us. We shouldn't demand that China abandon her nuclear weapons. This is not because China has proved herself worthy to have the means of mass annihilation, but rather because her existing stockpile of atomic missiles would make it too costly for us to threaten China. It's too late to stop the Chinese from gaining the ability to decimate us, but for the next ten years or so it is not too late to stop some of our other rivals. If it's politically impossible for America to use military force against currently non-hostile dictators then we should use trade sanctions to punish nations who don't agree to our proliferation policy. Normal trade sanctions, however, do not provide the punishing power necessary to induce dictators to abandon their arms. If we simply don't trade with a nation other countries will sell them the goods that we used to provide. To make trade sanctions an effective weapon the U.S. needs to deploy secondary boycotts. America should create a treaty, the signatories of which would agree to: • only trade with countries which have signed the treaty, and • not trade with any country which violates our policy on weapons proliferation. Believe that if only the U.S. and, say, Germany initially signed this treaty then nearly every other country would be forced to do so. For example, if France did not sign, they would be unable to trade with the U.S. or Germany. This would obviously be intolerable to France. Once the U.S., Germany and France adopted the treaty every European nation would have to sign or face a total economic collapse. The more countries which sign the treaty, the greater the pressure on other countries to sign. Once most every country has signed, any country which violated America's policy on weapons proliferation would face almost a complete economic boycott. Under this approach, the U.S. and Germany alone could use our economic power to dictate the enforcement mechanism of a treaty designed to protect against Armageddon. **Even the short-term survival of humanity is in doubt. The greatest threat of extinction surely comes from** the **prolif**eration of weapons of mass destruction. America should refocus her foreign policy to prioritize protecting us all from atomic, biological, and chemical weapons.

## Terrorism Impact

The nonproliferation regime is on the brink of collapse. Weak nuclear safety standards trigger wildfire prolif that guarantees nuclear terrorism. **Allison 08**[[6]](#footnote-6)

In my view, there is a substantial chance that we are living through the unraveling of the nonproliferation regime that has held back the spread of nuclear weapons, nuclear wars, and nuclear terrorism, for four decades. I agree with the conclusion of **the UN High Level Panel** on Threats, Challenges, and Change, which **warned that** the **erosion of the nonprolif**eration **regime is reaching a point** at **which** it **could "become irreversible, and result in a cascade of prolif**eration." As Henry Kissinger has noted, a defining challenge for statesmen is to recognize "a change in the international environment so likely to undermine national security that it must be resisted no matter what form the threat takes or how ostensibly legitimate it appears." An unraveling of the nonproliferation regime would constitute just such a transformation undermining the security of all civilized nations. The question is whether statesmen will act in time to prevent this catastrophe. 3. Risks in the Nuclear Renaissance. The nuclear renaissance that most observers expect to significantly expand the number of nuclear energy plants over the next several decades increases the risk that the nonproliferation regime will unravel. The increased risk comes not from new nuclear energy plants in themselves. Rather, it comes from the prevailing interpretation of the Nonproliferation Treaty that allows states that acquire nuclear energy reactors to also acquire a full fuel cycle. If the expansion of nuclear energy reactors leads to a proliferation of uranium enrichment facilities and reprocessing facilities for separating the spent fuel, **this will certainly provide** a **cover for new nuclear weapons states, significantly increasing risk**s that nuclear weapons end up in hands **of terrorists**. 4. Strengthened IAEA. The world needs a strengthened IAEA in a reinforced nonproliferation regime. **Unless** the current **standards** and practices **for nonprolif**eration, **security, and safety are** significantly **strengthened, current trend-lines will** abort the nuclear renaissance and **assist catastrophic attacks upon the United States** In IAEA language, the three S's - **safeguards** (accounting to deter and discover state diversion of peaceful nuclear energy applications to nuclear weapons programs), security (theft of nuclear material by crooks inside or outside a system who could sell this material to terrorists or states for making bombs), **and** safety (**prevention of accidents** like Chernobyl) — **need to be significantly strengthened.**

Terrorism is the most likely existential threat. **Rhodes 09**[[7]](#footnote-7)

The response was very different among nuclear and national security experts when Indiana Republican Sen. Richard Lugar surveyed PDF them in 2005.

This group of **85 experts judged that** the **possibility of** a **WMD attack** against a city or other target somewhere in the world **is real and increasing over time**. The median estimate of the risk of a nuclear attack somewhere in the world by 2010 was 10 percent. The risk of an attack by 2015 doubled to 20 percent median. **There was strong**, though not universal, **agreement that** a **nuclear attack is more likely** to be carried out **by a terrorist organization than by a government.** The group was split 45 to 55 percent on whether terrorists were more likely to obtain an intact working nuclear weapon or manufacture one after obtaining weapon-grade nuclear material. "The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is not just a security problem," Lugar wrote in the report's introduction. "It is the economic dilemma and the moral challenge of the current age. On September 11, 2001, the world witnessed the destructive potential of international terrorism. But the September 11 attacks do not come close to approximating the destruction that would be unleashed by a nuclear weapon. Weapons of mass destruction have made it possible for a small nation, or even a sub-national group, to kill as many innocent people in a day as national armies killed in months of fighting during World War II. "The bottom line is this," Lugar concluded: "For the foreseeable future, the United States and other **nations will face an existential threat** from the intersection of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction." It's paradoxical that a diminished threat of a superpower nuclear exchange should somehow have resulted in a world where the danger of at least a single nuclear explosion in a major city has increased (and that city is as likely, or likelier, to be Moscow as it is to be Washington or New York). We tend to think that a terrorist nuclear attack would lead us to drive for the elimination of nuclear weapons. I think the opposite case is at least equally likely: **A terrorist nuclear attack would almost certainly be followed by a retaliatory nuclear strike** on whatever country we believed to be sheltering the perpetrators. That response would surely **initiat[ing]**e **a new round of nuclear armament** and rearmament in the name of deterrence, however illogical. Think of how much 9/11 frightened us; think of how desperate our leaders were to prevent any further such attacks; think of the fact that we invaded and occupied a country, Iraq, that had nothing to do with those attacks in the name of sending a message.

## China Spillover Internal Link

Current expansion of unsafe nuclear energy in China risks meltdown.

**Decker 11** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

**The Middle Kingdom is earthquake-prone** and suffers regular damage from major tremors. **This augurs poorly for Beijing’s nuclear blueprint.** “China National Nuclear, the country’s top nuclear-power developer, said this week it planned to build a new nuclear plant in the southwestern metropolis of Chongqing,” reported the Wall Street Journal. Chongqing “is around 480 kilometers from the epicenter of a 7.9-magnitude earthquake in 2008 that left nearly 90,000 people dead or missing in neighboring Sichuan province.” Fault lines crisscross the mainland, **but the communist government** has high-priority **plans to hastily construct 28 new reactors in** the next **nine years.** The People's Republic of China (PRC) already is the world’s second-largest consumer of nuclear energy. **Another** relevant - and **frightening** - **factor is** **the Chinese** institutional practice of **cut**ting **corners** to try to get ahead. The power needs to sustain **China’s huge population** are putting pressure on the national energy grid, which in turn **puts pressure on authorities to speed up** their already mad sprint to build more nuke plants. Beijing announced yesterday that approval for new facilities was on hold while nuclear standards were reviewed, but it’s not as if “Made in China” is a brand that instills a lot of confidence either way. To put it gently, **Chinese quality is** years - if not **decades - behind Japan**, which is a global technological leader in many industries. If an unusually strong earthquake can lay waste to a first-world nation with strict building codes such as exist in the land of the rising sun, a record shock in backwards China would make last week’s devastation look like spring break in Fort Lauderdale. The nuclear crossroads raises broader questions about the PRC’s economic development and the myriad pitfalls therein. At the epicenter of the problem is feverish development to keep pace with demographic trends that see a growing middle class and hundreds of millions of rural poor migrating to cities. This all puts a tremendous squeeze on urban infrastructure. China needs to gobble up the lion’s share of the world’s resources - cement, steel, copper, aluminum, just about anything you can think of - to be able to maintain subsistence for its 1.3 billion souls, whose average per capita gross domestic product is a mere one-eleventh of America’s. “There is enormous friction between China’s need to grow quickly and its poor safety and quality-control standards,” Virginia Republican Rep. J. Randy Forbes, founder of the Congressional China Caucus, told me Wednesday. “It’s not just the nuclear sector; coal-mining fatalities are huge.” In other words, generating enough energy is fraught with peril in every direction. GDP growth in the PRC has averaged more than 9 percent since 1989 and reached as high as 14.2 percent in 1992 and 2007, according to the World Bank. Economists warn that dipping to 6 percent growth or even slowing down to 8 percent could cause severe shortages and social upheaval. Despite the recent robust economic numbers, the Communist Party is struggling to keep the country together and is in a panic over popular uprisings against authoritarian regimes, especially in the Middle East. For comparison, in a global economy fighting off recession, the rest of us would be tickled pink by half of China’s 2010 fourth-quarter expansion of 9.8 percent. Communist China presents a dual threat to the world. The first is its rising militarism and deeply held nationalistic belief that the time has come for Beijing to rule the world. **The** second **danger is that the whole country will just blow up.** The relentless urgency for substantial, sustained economic growth is a ticking time bomb.

US nuclear safety standards spill over to China. They’ll cooperate with us.

**NNSA 11** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

During a meeting of the Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) of the U.S.-China Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Technology (PUNG) Agreement, NNSA **Deputy Administrator** for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Anne **Harrington and Vice Administrator** Qian **Zhimin** of the China National Energy Administration **agreed that Chinese and U.S. experts would pursue** additional areas for **cooperation** and continue research and development into new technology to guarantee a safe and secure nuclear future. **They** also agreed to **establish a** new **joint working group** on radioactive source security **and stressed** the importance of developing **nuclear safety**, safeguards **and security** in parallel. This week’s meeting is the latest example of the expanding nuclear security cooperation between the United States and China. Earlier this year, during a state visit to Washington, D.C., by Chinese President Hu Jintao, the United States and China announced a memorandum of understanding for work at a Center of Excellence of nuclear security near Beijing. “**This meeting demonstrates** the broad range of active and **vital cooperation** between the United States and China and reaffirms our mutual commitment to implementing the nuclear security agendas of our presidents,” said NNSA Deputy Administrator Harrington. “This framework also facilitates a broad group of important bilateral initiatives between our two countries, including the U.S. - China Bilateral Civil Nuclear Energy Cooperative Action Plan.”

## Econ Turn

Nuclear power is key to the economy. **Zawatsky 08** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

The mainstream media and petty politicians would have Americans believe that we are faced with a set of mutually exclusive, insoluble problems: **energy security,** environmental security, giant **budget** deficits **and** ever-expanding **trade deficits**. But these challenges can't be separated-they **are all** related **symptoms of the same basic problem, energy.** And thankfully, we don't need an Alexander, great or otherwise, to meet the challenges posed by it. In fact, something of **a silver bullet exists: nuclear energy.** How is nuclear power the cure to all that ails us? Here's how: We import ten million barrels of oil every day. That costs us one billion dollars every day, adding $365 billion each year to our trade deficit. Nearly all of that imported petroleum goes into transportation fuels. Replacing all of the imported-oil horsepower with an equivalent amount of nuclear-generated power eliminates nearly 30 percent of the trade deficit. But how do you run cars on nuclear power? The answer can be found in two words: "hydrogen" and "hybrids." If America constructed 104 new nuclear plants, we would add enough base electrical capacity to power every car and truck on the road today, because electricity can convert water into hydrogen (H2O plus electricity equals H2 plus O2) to fuel both modified internal-combustion engines and fuel-cell electric engines. And by adding plugs to existing gas-electric hybrids, owners could refuel their cars at home. Why 104 new nuclear plants? Because we already have that many in operation. We simply build two thousand additional megawatts of capacity at each current location. Then we avoid the not-in-my-backyard problem. And there's no need to worry about safety: the days of Chernobyl-type facilities are long gone. That was an Edsel. A nuclear plant designed today is a Lexus. Why hydrogen? Because it is made from water. Not a carbon atom in sight, so no greenhouse gases. When hydrogen is combusted in a modified internal-combustion engine (yes, the technology is off the shelf) or used to power a fuel cell (without combustion), it produces no harmful by-products. Plug-in hybrids? That's a no-brainer. Adding plugs to basic gas-electric hybrids would allow commuters to "refuel" at home, overnight (when, conveniently, electric rates are lower). As most round-trip commutes are less than fifty miles, not a drop of gasoline would be burned the whole workweek, and not a wisp of greenhouse gasses would be emitted, assuaging European concerns about America's energy use. So that solves the trade deficit, the energy deficit and the environmental issue. But what about the budget deficit? Easy: We need to increase the capacity of the nuclear plants and secure them against terrorist attack. We need to build the electrolyzers and compressors to be placed at every service station in America, to convert water into compressed hydrogen to fuel cars and trucks. We need to increase the capacity of the power-transmission lines to deliver the larger supply of electricity to the service stations. We need to build the plug-in hybrids and the appliances for rapid recharging. All of this building and manufacturing adds wages and profits to the economy. The nuclear facilities are built here, with American labor and American equipment. The electric transmission lines are built here, with American labor and equipment. The electrolyzers and compressors and plug-in hybrids should be built here, with American labor and equipment. And these are high-wage positions in engineering, construction and manufacturing. The **added wages** and profits **mean** substantially **higher** income **tax collection**s (without raising tax rates). On the expense side of the ledger, military spending, to maintain the forward posture of our forces to keep the oil flowing to our country, could be reduced substantially. Increased revenue and reduced spending. That’s the sweet sound of deficit reduction that you’re hearing. How much does this all cost? Less than you would think. Far from breaking the bank, it will actually enrich the treasury. The cost to build it all is $3 trillion over ten years. But, no worries: Establish a federal lending institution, along the lines of Freddie Mac or Fannie Mae, to create a secondary market for revenue-based loans originated by existing commercial lenders to the utilities and the hydrogen retailers. Money would flow into these loans from all around the world, because they would be backed by physical plant and equipment producing the world’s most important commodity, power. **Money flowing into the U**nited **S**tates **would stabilize the free-falling dollar. Interest rates would go down.** This would make us all richer to boot, as **the stock market** (in which most people have a substantial portion of their retirement savings), **reacting to** lower budget deficits, lower interest rates and **energy security, would move higher in a sustainable way.**

Nuclear industry is key to the economy. **Adams 10** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

The Nuclear Energy Institute, the American Nuclear Society and the North American Young Generation in Nuclear have been investing time and money into focused workforce development programs for several years. The people leading the effort are taking the action to ensure that there are educated and trained people who are ready to meet the challenge of continuing to reliably operate and maintain our existing fleet of 104 nuclear reactors at the same time that we are reestablishing our nuclear plant manufacturing and construction industry. In 1950 manufacturing accounted for more than 30 percent of all U.S. employment. These skilled labor careers provided an unprecedented standard of living for more than two decades following the end of World War II, allowing millions of Americans to purchase homes and autos and pay for their children to go to college. By 2006, **manufacturing** employment **shrunk to** a mere **10 percent of U.S. employment and with it** the bulk of America’s well-paying **skilled labor** careers. **Prognosticators predicted manufacturing’s ultimate demise** as a significant driver of the American economy. **But** a look at **the** U.S. **nuclear industry tells a different story:** a narrative **where job growth in** the **skilled trades is** on an **up**ward trend and **the industry can serve as a role model for** the revitalization of **the** U.S. **manufacturing sector** through the creation of new careers and economic expansion. In fact, it already has.
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